

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-6, 20-24, 26-30 and 32-35 remain pending in the present application. Claims 2, 7-19, 25 and 31 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 24 and 30 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 6, 24, 29-30 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Onoe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,361,396). Claims 2, 25 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims (1, 24 and 30), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 2 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 2 and Claim 2 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 6, which depends from Claim 1 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 depended from Claim 24. Claim 24 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 25 and Claim 25 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 24, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 29, which depends Claim 24 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 31 depended from Claim 30. Claim 30 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 31 and Claim 31 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 30, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise Claim 35, which depends Claim 30 is also believed to patentability distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tiedemann, Jr. (U.S. App. No. 20020142776 A1). Claims 7 and 11 have been cancelled.

Claims 4, 10, 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onoe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,361,396) in view of Rick et al. (U.S. Pat. App.. No. 20030174760 A1). Claims 4, 10, 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onoe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,361,396) in view of Bayley (U.S. Pat. No. 6,101,173). Claim 4 depends from Claim 1. Claim 27 depends from Claim 24. Claim 33 depends from Claim 30. As discussed above, Claims 1, 24, and 30 have been amended and are now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 4, 27 and 33 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5, 26, 28, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onoe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,361,396) in view of Tiedemann, Jr. (U.S. App. No. 20020142776 A1). Claims 3 and 5 depend from Claim 1. Claims 26 and 28 depend from Claim 30. Claims 32 and 34 depend from Claim 30. As discussed above, Claims 1, 24, and 30 have been amended and are now believed to patentably

distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 3, 5, 26, 28, 32 and 34 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiedemann, Jr. (U.S. App. No. 20020142776 A1) in view of Lopes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,494 B1). Claims 8, 12 and 13 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiedemann, Jr. (U.S. App. No. 20020142776 A1) in view of applicant's own admission of standards. Claims 15-17 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidemann, Jr. (U.S. App. No. 20020142776 A1) in view of Lopes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,494 B1) as applied to Claim 8 above, and further in view of applicant's own admission. Claim 9 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidemann, Jr. (U.S. App. No. 20020142776 A1) in view of Lopes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,494 B1) as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of Rick et al. (U.S. App. No. 20030174760 A1). Claim 14 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidemann, Jr. (U.S. App. No. 20020142776 A1) in view of applicant's own admission as

applied to Claim 17 above, and further in view of Lopes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,494 B1). Claims 18 and 19 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Claims 2, 25 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims (1, 24, 30), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above, Claims 2, 25 and 31 have been incorporated into their respective base claim.

Claims 20-23 are allowable.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 10, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/hmr